DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 384 HE 021 075

AUTHOR	Craddick, Jan
TITLE	Developing a Policy for Academic Appointment and Rank for Sheldon Jackson College.
PUB DATE	Nov 87
NOTE	80p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Rank (Professional); Church Related Colleges; College Faculty; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Governance; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; *Personnel Policy; Policy Formation; Private Colleges; Public Service; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; Records (Forms); Seminars; *Teacher Employment
IDENTIFIERS	*Sheldon Jackson College AK

ABSTRACT

A practicum to develop a policy for academic appointment and rank for Sheldon Jackson College (Alaska) faculty is described. The practicum conducted a case study of internal governance at other institutions. Letters were sent to 67 members of the Association of Presbyterian Colleges and Universities and three related colleges to obtain data relating to standards for appointment and criteria for retention and promotion. Usable responses were received from 38 colleges. The data were analyzed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the faculty. The committee recommended a policy for academic appointment and rank based on: expertise and knowledge in discipline, professional performance, service to the college and community, and service to the profession. Four ranks were recommended: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. The master's degree or equivalent is required for the instructor level and the terminal degree is needed for the other levels. A system of continual year or term contracts was also suggested. Forms for student ratings of courses and instructors and for rating faculty for promotion/tenure are appended, along with information on procedures for self and peer evaluation and division professional growth plans. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290384

DEVELOPING A POLICY FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT AND RANK FOR SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE

Seminar: Governance and Management

by

Jan Craddick, M.A.

Sheldon Jackson College

Cluster Coordinator: F. Marvin Hole, Ed.D.

Cluster: Anchorage

A Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University
November 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jan Craddick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE021 075

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to conduct a case study of internal governance at other institutions in order to develop a policy for academic appointment and rank to recommend to the faculty of Sheldon Jackson College.

Letters were sent to 67 other members of the Association of Presbyterian College and Universities as well as four other minority colleges and three related colleges asking for data relating to standards for appointment and criteria for retention and promotion. Responses were received from 44 colleges. All but six of these were able to supply the data requested. This data was analyzed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the faculty, and on the basis of that analysis, the committee has recommended a Policy for Academic Appointment and Rank based on (1) expertise and knowledge in discipline, (2) professional performance, (3) service to college and community, and (4) service to the profession. It has recommended four ranks: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor with the Master's degree or equivalent being required for the instructor level and the terminal degree required for the other levels.

Further, it has recommended that a system of continual year or term contracts be established.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT.....ii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION.....1

Importance of the Issue.....1

A Changing Mission.....1

Structure.....2

Administration.....2

Academic Structure.....2

Governance.....3

Faculty Organization.....5

Faculty Make-up.....6

2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE.....8

Governance.....8

Search of the Literature.....11

Collegiality.....11

Tenure.....14

Innovation.....18

Morale and Performance.....18

Academic Freedom.....19

Merit Rating.....19

3. PROCEDURES.....21

Sources of Data.....21

Guidelines.....22

4. RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....24
Faculty Appointment and Promotion.....24
Rank.....24
Criteria.....25
Procedure.....29
Other Aspects of Governance.....30
Tenure.....30
Faculty Organization.....31
Funding Priorities.....31
5. RECOMMENDATIONS.....33
Rank.....33
Criteria.....34
Expertise and Knowledge.....34
Professional Performance.....34
Service to College/Community.....34
Service to Profession.....34
Point System.....35
Evaluation.....35
Other Points of Governance.....36
Implementation.....36
REFERENCES.....38
APPENDICES
A. LETTER TO PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGES.....40

B. SUMMARY OF DATA FOR COLLEGES SURVEYED.....41
C. PRELIMINARY POLICY FOR ACADEMIC RANK.....42
D. RECOMMENDED POLICY FOR ACADEMIC RANK.....43

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Issue

A Changing Mission

Sheldon Jackson College, a non-profit privately funded liberal arts college located in Sitka, Alaska, had its beginning in 1878 as a training school for Tlingit Indians. In the 1900's it added an elementary school, in the 1920's a high school, and in 1944 a college program. From 1966, the year the high school closed, until 1975, the year a four year elementary education program was initiated, Sheldon Jackson College was a fully accredited two year college. In 1984, baccalaureate degrees in Business Administration, Aquatic Resources, and Natural Resource Management were added, and, in 1987, the Bachelor's degree in Liberal Arts was implemented. Throughout these transition periods, Sheldon Jackson maintained its educational goal to provide a college education for all Alaskans and its historic mission to serve Alaska Native (Indian, Aleut, and Eskimo) students. It should be noted, however, that the shift in mission from a two year to a four year institution altered the make-up and expectations of the faculty and led to the appointment

of an ad hoc faculty committee to examine and propose changes in policy, schedules, and other aspects of academic governance at Sheldon Jackson College.

Structure

Administration. Sheldon Jackson College is operated by an independent Board of Trustees. Its principal administrative officers are the President, Vice President for Administration, Vice President for Academic Programs (Dean), and Vice President for Student Services.

The Faculty and Staff Handbook is the official administrative and academic guideline for the college. Under the present structure, the Handbook can be revised at any time by the President or by the faculty with the approval of the Dean and President. A change in administration in 1982 resulted in changes in organizational structure which, like the change in mission, impacted the faculty.

Academic Structure. Divisional structure and governance represented one aspect of the structural change. Up to 1982 the faculty was divided into three divisions comprised of: Arts and Humanities, Science and Mathematics, and Social Sciences and Education. Each division elected a chairperson, who served at the pleasure of the division. Under the revised organizational structure, the faculty was

divided into four divisions: Science and Mathematics, Education and Business Administration, Liberal Arts, and Learning Resources. The action separated the Education and Business Departments from Social Science and combined Arts and Humanities with the the remaining Social Sciences into a single Liberal Arts division. Library Services was expanded to division status as Learning Resources. Each division was headed by an appointed chair, who reported to and served at the pleasure of the Academic Dean. The Director of Learning Resources chaired her division.

Governance. Through 1982 a series of committees carried out many of the governance functions of the college (Faculty and Staff Handbook, 1981). The most important of these were the President's Advisory Council, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Judiciary Council for Student Affairs. Also important to both faculty and staff was the Professional Development Committee.

The Advisory Council, consisting of the Academic Dean, Business Manager, Advancement Director, Staff Chairperson, Faculty Vice Cnairperson, Chaplain, Director of Student Services, Director of Admissions, and Title III Coordinator, functioned as the President's Cabinet.

The Academic Affairs Committee consisted of the

Academic Dean, who served as permanent chair of the committee; four non-administrative faculty; the vice-chair of the faculty; the chairs of each of the three Academic Divisions; the Director of Library Services; two students appointed by student government in consultation with the Dean; one student personnel member; the Registrar; and the Curriculum Specialist. The purpose of the Committee was to assist the Dean in providing oversight in the development and evaluation of the academic curriculum and to serve as a working committee of the faculty.

The Judiciary Council was made up of one staff member, three faculty members and three students. Two faculty members were elected by the faculty. All three students were appointed by student government. The third faculty member and the staff member were appointed by the President, who also appointed the committee chair from the above members. The Director of Student Services served as an ex-officio member. The Council was responsible for student conduct in that it recommended policies, approved rules from minor tribunals, and heard cases of violations from the Student Conduct Code.

The Professional Development Committee, consisting of a Chair, appointed by the President, and two faculty representatives and two staff representatives, selected by

the President from recommendations of their respective organizations, reviewed professional development grant proposals from personnel and recommended proposals and expenditures to the President.

Under the revised structure (Faculty and Staff Handbook, 1986) the committees changed their focus and became more advisory. Three committees - Academic Programs, Administrative Affairs, and Student Affairs - met with the respective Vice Presidents for those areas. The Academic Programs Committee no longer served as a committee of the faculty. The Student Services Committee (which replaced the Judiciary Council) no longer had a judicial function, except for student appeals of institutional policy. The functions of the Professional Development Committee were assumed by the Academic Programs Committee. The Vice Presidents met with the President and, with the Director of Admissions and Special Assistant for Public Relations, functioned as the President's Cabinet.

Faculty Organization. Faculty organization was also changed. The President has been designated as chairman of the faculty by the Board of Trustees, Up to 1982 the faculty elected from its membership a vice-chairman (Handbook, 1981) whose responsibility was to:

1. Determine faculty meeting agenda in cooperation with the President and Academic Dean;

2. Preside over faculty meetings in the absence of the President;

3. Sit on the Academic Affairs Committee as co-chairman;

4. Assure adequate communication of Academic Affairs Committee activities and decisions to the whole faculty;

5. Assist the Academic Dean in necessary faculty concerns.

Under the revised structure, that authority was delegated to the Vice President for Academic Programs. There was no vice-chairman.

Faculty Make-up. During Sheldon Jackson's years as a two-year institution, the faculty, typical of most two year institutions, was composed of instructors with Master's and Bachelor's degrees. All members of the faculty were ranked as instructors - a pattern also typical of a two year institution. The pattern changed with the advent of the Bachelor's degrees. In Spring 1987, when the faculty expressed its concerns to the administration, eight of the thirty-five full and part-time faculty and academic staff had doctorates or other terminal degrees; one had an A.B.D., and three were completing doctoral or other terminal degree work. All but three of the remaining faculty had master's

degrees. Two of these were part-time instructors. The third had an M.S. in progress. In addition, the college had two Distinguished Faculty Fellows (DFF's), both with terminal degrees.

Several faculty had come from teaching positions at other universities where they had been assistant or associate professors. They were, properly, concerned with the title "instructor" and with the lack of faculty rank. Faculty members were also concerned with faculty salary and the method of determining it. Sheldon Jackson College operates with a salary scale based on broad ranges within the Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral areas. Experience, work beyond a degree, research, and merit are not listed as criteria.

The faculty addressed its concerns to the President and was given approval to work with the Academic Vice President to develop such criteria. The purpose of this practicum, therefore, was to (1) review the literature relating to the internal governance of an institution and (2) examine policy, schedules and other aspects of Academic governance at other colleges and universities in order to develop, with the committee, such a schedule.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Governance

The case study of internal governance at other institutions and the examination of policies, salary schedules and other aspects of faculty decision making was directly related to the study of Governance and Management. Groff et. al. (1983), addressing the development and maintenance of governance systems, stress the importance of such a system to the institution, noting that it "has too great an impact on the entire institution and is, therefore, too important to be allowed to develop and function in a haphazard manner." Questions which institutions need to answer in order to develop and maintain their systems of internal governance include:

> 1. Is the system clearly and consciously understood by those who need to understand it? Is it perceived accurately? (A system intended to be collegial is not effective if most of those involved in it perceive it to be bureaucratic.)
>
> 2. Are the people in the institution satisfied with the existing system of internal governance? If not, in what ways do they wish the system changed?
>
> 3. Do those involved know and accept the roles they play in the system?
>
> 4. Has the system been analyzed to the extent that various component individuals and groups (committees,

task forces, faculty senates etc.) have been identified?

5. Has the system been analyzed to the extent that the component processes involved in the system have been identified? (Such processes include the communications system used during the process of decision making, the flow of decision making authority, etc.)

6. Has there been a study of the governance of the institution? Is a study feasible?

7. Does the system work in that appropriate decisions are made in a manner consistent with the operational philosophy of the institution?

8. Is there a commitment at the institution to the continuous maintenance of its system of internal governance?

Several of the above questions were relevant to Sheldon Jackson College and were recommended for consideration by the ad hoc committee.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1940, 1977) recommends faculty involvement in long-range planning, in decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources, in budgeting and in the selection of a new president, academic deans, and other chief academic officers. They have taken positions (1977) on a number of points relevant to this study.

> The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process....The power of review or final

> decision lodged in the governing board or delegated...to the president should be excercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances.
>
> Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility. This area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty...is based on the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field...have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues.... Determinations in these matters should be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board.
>
> The chairman or head of a department...should be selected whether by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department .... The department head should not have tenure in his office (emphasis added).

Chait and Ford (1982) have addressed an issue of major concern to the committee: "When policies are to be changed or modified, the college must decide whether the new policy will apply to all faculty or whether some shall be exempted by a 'grandfather clause' and whether to compose a new policy locally or to import word for word a 'model statement' by a professional association." They recommend:

> 1. Changes in policy should be preceded by a statement of policy objectives, an enumeration of the alternatives, and a simulation, wherever possible, of the probable results.
>
> 2. Faculty should be consulted, especially when prospective changes affect the faculty.

3. Legal counsel should be obtained to ascertain the need for "grandfather clauses."

4. Policies and procedures should be selected and drafted by the institution.

5. Policy makers should not underestimate the latitude available to an institution to develop policies and define terms particularly well suited to local conditions.

6. Policy makers should weigh each word carefully.

7. Once enacted, policy changes should be widely publicized and disseminated, especially among persons most affected by the change.

Search of the Literature

Collegiality

Since Sheldon Jackson is a private, church related college, faculty and administration were concerned that any policy recommended by the ad hoc committee fit within the framework of collegial decision making. Such decision making requires cooperation from both faculty and administration. Faculty must be willing to participate in the system; the institution must find ways of recognizing or rewarding that involvement.

Advantages of the collegial system (Groff, 1983) include more people involved in the decision making process, therefore, more commitment to the decisions being made, and greater access by the institution to the talents of a great

many intelligent, educated people. Disadvantages include a slower decision making process, decisions more difficult to achieve, and rules and responsibilities for governance less likely to be understood or accepted. Groff outlines solutions to these problems:

(1) the institution can put into printed form as much as possible of the structure and operational procedures of its collegial system;

(2) information concerning the institution's committee system with current membership, terms of appointment, committee charges, and reporting procedures should be available to all involved;

(3) the institution should publicize the successes, past and current, of the system since many decisions made collegially may be assumed by those who were not at the institution when the decision was made to have always existed.

Wolotkiewicz (1980) has noted that faculty at private institutions "tend to be more highly involved in decision making...traditionally in the academic area with primary responsibility, even autonomy, with respect to curriculum, degree requirements, research efforts, and policies relating to the educational aspects of student life."

Milett (1980) notes that in matters of academic affairs, faculty members have considerable authority upon such questions as degree programs, degree requirements, course offerings, <u>faculty personnel actions</u> (emphasis added), admissions standards, the academic calendar, and

student conduct regulations.

Blackburn et. al. (1980) conclude that faculty members want to be consulted about matters that affect the academic program and its administration - who sets policy with respect to entrance requirements, curriculum and degree requirements, the selection of colleagues and supervisors (emphasis added) and the like.

Since recent alterations by administration in the academic structure at Sheldon Jackson College stemmed partly from a lack of awareness on the part of new administrators and faculty that such decisions had, theretofore, been made jointly by faculty and administrators, partly from a change in management style, and partly from a failure by the faculty to exercise their collegial rights; it was important for the ad hoc committee to include with their recommended policy the system of faculty involvement in the administration of that policy.

Smelser (1973) and Trow (1984) have examined the reasons behind the changes in faculty involvement in governance. Smelser argues that although the academic profession retains to a remarkable degree "the fundamental nature of a calling" in the universities, this is not the case in the four year and junior colleges. There he has found "...a tendency to rely more upon bureaucratic

controls, such as the authority of chairmen, deans and presidents, and to treat the occupational role more in the nature of a job than a calling."

Trow has found, "When internal professional controls, institutionalized as faculty senates and other forms of collegial self-government, are weak, the management and control from outside are stronger.... In the United States, faculty unionization...and along with it collective bargaining...bureaucratize the academic organization.... The union stance leads to standardized regulation of the work role, substitutes blanket job security and promotion by seniority for earned and competitive tenure and promotion by merit, and further undercuts collegiality." He concludes:

> Bureaucratization of the colleges and the stronger role of unions in them and in some of the universities threaten...collegial governance and academic freedom which has traditionally underpinned the pursuit of excellence in scholarship and research. When these characteristics have been pursued...faculty members have improved their status and the quality of their academic work as well.

Tenure

Sheldon Jackson College operates with term contracts, as opposed to a tenure system. As Chait and Ford (1982) have noted, term contracts constitute a commonplace aspect of a conventional tenure system. What is unusual within the realm

of contemporary practice is the use of contracts to the exclusion of tenure. In 1973-74 about one-third of all two-year and community colleges but only six percent of all four-year colleges had contract systems. The question of tenure, thus, was an issue to be considered by the ad hoc committee.

The AAUP (1977) holds that after a "probationary period, teachers...should have tenure and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause..." Termination for cause "should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution."

The College and University Personnel Association (1980) examined the tenure policy of 254 of the 583 institutions classified as "liberal Arts colleges" by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1973). The 254 institutions included six that were public and 248 that were private. Two hundred and fifteen of the 254 institutions awarded tenure. Twenty-nine of the 215 institutions that award tenure expressed their policy both in writing and through established practices. One hundred and eighty-seven communicate policy in written form alone.

Lincoln (1983) notes that institutions of higher education are taking a careful look at decisions about

promotion and tenure and suggests three reasons for their concern: first, shifting and declining enrollments; second, severe fiscal problems; and third, a large number of tenured faculty already in place. She has examined a number of issues relating to promotion and tenure and proposes a series of principles to follow:

1. Judgments of merit and worth are both important but for different reasons.

2. Worth and merit need to be judged separately and by different criteria.

3. Faculty members are best equipped to make merit judgments while administrators are best equipped to make worth judgments. Both judgments need input from both groups.

4. In relation to judgments of merit, points to be considered include:

   a. Merit should be judged on the standards of a reference group of professionals.

   b. Merit should not be judged until faculty members have sufficient time in rank to demonstrate their accomplishments.

   c. Merit should be understood as being reference group specific.

   d. The most relevant judgments of merit are made by the candidates' immediate peer groups.

   e. Merit (promotion) judgments should be made at the department level.

   f. Both faculty member and university should have available appeal channels.

   g. The faculty member should not be subjected to double jeopardy.

5. In relation to worth, several other principles apply:

   a. Worth should be judged on the standards of the institution.

   b. Worth should not be judged until the faculty member has sufficient time in nontenured status to demonstrate his/her institutional contribution.

   c. Worth should be understood to be reference group specific.

   d. The most relevant judgments of worth are at the most distant unit from the faculty member, i.e. the highest levels of the university.

   e. Worth (tenure) judgments should be made at the university level.

   f. Both faculty member and university should have available appeal channels.

6. The faculty member should not be subjected to multiple jeopardy.

Chait and Ford have examined the effects of term contracts at several institutions and conclude that contract systems do not produce significant faculty turnover as a result of nonreappointments. Nearly all institutions renew nearly all contracts. They offer several explanations especially relevant to Sheldon Jackson:

> A Shared Burden of Proof. Term contracts place a premium on professional growth and development. The campus community assumes there will be professional development and that the college will contribute both recommendations and resources to that growth. The institute must share with the professor the burden of faculty development (emphasis added).

Elusive Evaluations. Faculty at the schools examined are expected, above all else, to teach and advise students. These crafts have traditionally been considered more difficult to assess than scholarship.

Lack of Evidence and Support. As currently practiced, term contract systems do not foster the production of evidentiary documentation to defend and sustain nonrenewable decisions. Given the short-term nature of term contracts, the use of open files, and the opportunity for the judged to eventually evaluate the judges, there is little reason to believe that faculty will regularly offer critical commentaries about candidates for reappointment.

Allure of Incrementalism. The very nature of a renewable decision invites a decision to renew. Short-term appointments are short-term risks that most decision makers are inclined to take.

Innovation. Chait and Ford have examined the effects of term contracts on innovation, but have not determined from the available data a causal relationship. They have. however, noted that a long-term commitment (tenure), a long-term perspective, and a sense of security are prerequisites to the pursuit and implementation of new ideas. They cite the proposition stated by the Harvard Committee on Governance (1971):

> Most of the major experimental changes in Harvard education...have derived from the thinking, time, and energies of tenured faculty members.... Tenure is one of the major stimuli to experimentation...

Morale and Performance. They also have examined the effects of the contract system on faculty morale and performance, but again have not ascertained a causal

relationship from the available data. They have, however, drawn inferences about the effect of contracts on certain circumstances such as perspective, communication, and evaluation:

> Perspective. "What do I need to do to make the case for reappointment?" haunts the faculty member on a term contract, much as "What do I need to do to achieve tenure?" haunts the probationary faculty member. In the view of one dean, "Only a long-term commitment allows a call on the faculty at any time; only then is a faculty member's long-term development tied to the college's long-term development."
>
> Communication. Faculty growth contracts force professors to set goals. The mandate to extend or terminate contracts forces the college to consider and, ideally, respond to these plans.
>
> Evaluation. Term contracts promote more frequent communication about performance and demand periodic attention to performance evaluation.

Academic Freedom. They have also examined the effects of term contracts on academic freedom and conclude that academic freedom can be and has been provided at colleges with term contract systems, noting: "If academic freedom translates as due process, we believe that all the procedural protections afforded tenured faculty can be made available to faculty on term contracts."

Merit Rating

Another issue addressed by the ad hoc committee was merit rating. McIntosh and Van Hoevering (1986) have

conducted a six-year study of faculty peer reviews, merit ratings and pay awards and examined several outcomes of the merit review process:

1. How teaching, scholarship, institutional service and community outreach relate to the overall annual merit rating obtained by a faculty member.

2. Whether academic rank is related to merit performance.

3. How merit performance affects merit pay and overall base salary changes.

4. How...administrative allocations impact the final base salary adjustment.

They have found that high scores in scholarly activity were the best predictor of overall merit ratings. The top 20% of the 36 faculty in the study were those with the highest performance rating in scholarship. Those ranked in the second 20% received the highest number of superior ratings for instruction. They recommend merit pay allocations tied to merit performance review scores, and merit rewards allocated on the basis of performance rather than as a percentage of base pay so that the amount is meaningful to the recipient.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

Sources of Data

Since Sheldon Jackson College is a member of the Association of Presbyterian College and Universities, letters (Appendix A) were sent to members of that organization, as well as to relevant minority colleges, asking for data relating to standards for appointment and guidelines for teaching, research, public/institutional service, faculty workload, and evaluation for retention and promotion. The letters also requested information about the administrative structure of faculty and about the handling of middle management positions, i.e. department and division chairs.

Responses were received from 44 colleges. Of these, only six (who were revising or preparing materials) were not able to supply the committee with the requested data. In some instances, the respondees were able to answer all the committee's questions. In other instances, they were not.

This data was reviewed by the ad hoc committee and summarized (Appendix B). A model was developed for appointment, examined in terms of faculty presently on staff and used as a means of examining models at other

institutions. The summary and model served as guidelines for development of a first draft of a Policy for Academic Appointment and Rank (Appendix C) which was distributed to the full faculty for review. Following faculty review a second draft was prepared (Appendix D). Upon faculty approval the policy will be forwarded to the President with a request for action.

Although policies at Presbyterian institutions represented an important source of information, policies at other private and public institutions were also reviewed. through a search of the literature.

Guidelines

In each step of the review, there were at least two questions. Did we want to recommend this procedure? If so, what was most suitable for Sheldon Jackson College. Areas studied were:

Governance:

Tenure: the number of schools granting tenure

Faculty: what members of the staff were classified as faculty and included as voting members of the faculty?

Faculty Governance: what procedures were used in appointing and promoting faculty?

Priorities: what funds were provided for professional growth and development?

Rank:

Levels

Degree(s) required

Teaching experience required

Professional development required

Research required

Contributions to institution or profession required

Modes of Evaluation;

What means of evaluation were already in place?

What means of evaluation needed to be developed?

Should judgements be made by each division or by a committee composed of representatives of the full faculty?

Chapter 4

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Faculty Appointment and Promotion

Rank. Regular full-time appointments to the faculty were made, by most schools in the study, at the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Appointments for temporary or part-time faculty varied. The College of Idaho, for example, gave the prefix "Visiting" to temporary full-time appointments and the title "Lecturer" to part-time faculty. Also involved were steps within rank. Manaster (1985) described the University of California step system for the appointment and advancement of faculty. In this system each faculty member was appointed to a rank and, within that rank, to a step. Each step carried with it a salary according to a published salary scale revised annually. Regular faculty were appointed as assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Promotions from one rank to another were based on merit and were not automatic. Advancement from one step to another was dependent upon demonstration of achievement. The normal periods of service were two years at each step of the assistant and associate ranks and three at each step of the professor rank.

Among the colleges responding to the survey, there were, in most instances, 3 to 4 levels or steps at each rank.

Criteria. Addressing the subject of criteria, the Commission on Higher Education (1972) specified that "criteria for promotion should define what the institution requires in the assumption of responsibilities outside the classroom and the importance it attaches to scholarly or creative work."

At the University of California each academic personnel action was based upon judgements concerning the candidate's performance in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) university and public service.

The merit rating procedure at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (McIntosh and Koevering, 1986) was based on (1) teaching (2) scholarship, (3) institutional development, and (4) outreach. Each faculty member completed an annual report covering these topics in the following manner:

1. Teaching
   a. Courses taught each semester
   b. Individualized and extended degree instruction
   c. New course development, innovations or special techniques of instruction
   d. Methods used for evaluating teaching

2. Scholarly activity
   a. Publications, manuscripts, reports, performances, recitals, exhibitions, manuals, films, videotapes, etc.
   b. Grants solicited and outcome; awards, hónors
   c. Activities in progress

3. Institutional development
   a. Service on elected committees, task forces, etc.
   b. Administrative responsibilities
   c. Program development (not dealt with under teaching)
   d. Student advising

4. Community Outreach
   a. Activities which utilize professional expertise
   b. Non-credit teaching and presentations given related to professional area

Linsky and Straus (1975) studied the relationship between research and classroom performance at 16 colleges and universities. They concluded, " If the goal of an institution is only teaching, and research is seen as either unimportant or as instrumental to productive good teaching, then there is little point to take research productivity into account in hiring and promoting, since these data suggest that research is not necessary for good teaching" (emphasis added).

Chait and Ford (1982) stressed the need for clear and explicit criteria for promotion, "Unless the nature or mission of the institution shifts, the criteria...should remain unchanged, although the standards will change as a faculty member seeks advancement in rank." They found of

great value a criteria system in which faculty are evaluated "on the basis of a negotiated allocation of time and attention that enables faculty to fashion a work load consistent with personal interests and aptitudes and consistent with institutional priorities." They cited the system at St. Olaf where general criteria were priority listed and within each criterion subcategories were rank-ordered. Summarized, these were as follows:

1. Effective teaching
   a. Extent of mastery of subject matter
   b. Ability to stimulate the intellectual development of students in the area of one's own discipline.
   c. Effectiveness of classroom teaching.
   d. Demonstrated concern for the role of one's discipline in liberal education.
   e. Ability to relate professional goals to the needs and goals of one's students as whole persons.

2. Significant professional activity
   a. Excellence and extent of public professional activity.
   b. Ability to relate scholarship, research and creative activity to effective teaching.
   c. Success in stimulating the intellectual development of one's colleagues.

3. Other contributions to the purposes of the college
   a. Contributions to department and college planning and administration.
   b. Contributions to the life of the college as a community and leadership in achieving the goals of the college.
   c. Contributions in extending the resources of the college to the wider community.

They also cited a University of Texas procedure (1980) that seemed especially appropriate to the Sheldon Jackson

College situation. Basic criteria were:

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Student advisement
3. Research and other scholarly activity
4. University committee work
5. Contribution to discipline
6. Leadership effectiveness
7. Assistance to newer faculty
8. Community service
9. Consulting (paid or grants)

General procedures to be followed were:

1. Faculty member meets with faculty review committee to present evidence of success in the criterion categories and to answer questions concerning these categories.

2. Faculty member's file is reviewed by each committee member.

3. Committee discusses evidence gathered in the processes above.

4. If advisable, individual committee members interview specific persons to clarify or obtain additional data for review.

5. An overall rating is made with the following options:

a. Research to be considered:

(1) Criteria 1 & 2 have possible	50 points
(2) Criterion 3 total possible	20 points
(3) Criteria 4-9 possible	30 points
Total necessary for reappointment	65 points

b. No research option:

(1) Criteria 1 & 2 have possible	60 points
(2) Criteria 4-9 total possible	40 points
Total necessary for reappointment	65 points

Procedure. Most colleges in the study involved some sort of faculty committee in the process of rank and status; e.g. a Rank and Tenure Committee, an Educational Policy Committee, or a Faculty Personnel Committee. All spelled out a process for peer and supervisor recommendations.

At the University of California, an academic personnel action was normally initiated by a department chair after consultation with and, in some cases, a vote by department faculty (Manaster, 1985). A file containing the recommendation and supporting documentation was assembled by the department chair and reviewed by administrative officers who added their recommendations. The file was then reviewed by a committee of the Academic Senate. The senate committee provided the administration with a list from which a secret ad hoc review committee was appointed. The ad hoc committee usually included one member from the candidate's department and two to four faculty members from other departments. This committee either endorsed, modified or opposed the original departmental recommendation. The senate committee reviewed the entire file, prepared its own recommendation, and submitted the file to the administration for action. Manaster emphasized that almost every participant in and observer of this process acknowledged the dominant role of

the faculty even though the final action was taken by the campus administration.

Performance review at Wisconsin was conducted annually by a five or six member subcommittee made up of the department chairman, subchairman, plus three of four tenured faculty selected by the faculty in the department. The subcommittee met only when all members could be present. Notice of the review was posted and the faculty could attend their review, otherwise the review was closed to the public. The results of the review were communicated to the faculty member within 30 days and also sent to the dean.

The committee members after reading an annual report and supporting documents made an evaluation on a 1 to 5 scale in each of the four categories. A rating of 3 was considered a satisfactory, 5 as superior. A final merit rating was obtained by summation of the individual scores.

Other Aspects of Governance

Tenure. Twenty-five or the twenty-six colleges who responded to the question about tenure awarded tenure. The college which did not award tenure did award extended contracts after four years of employment. The first extended contract was for five years, the second for six years, the third for seven years, and the fourth for ten years.

Faculty Organization. In most colleges the faculty included the president, vice-president for academic programs, regular faculty, professional library staff, and the registrar. Faculty meetings were handled in a variety of ways. In most instances the president was designated by the governing body as the chair of the faculty. In some instances the vice-president for academic programs or academic dean presided in his absence. In other instances, an elected vice-chairman presided.

Division and department chairs were appointed by the president or vice-president for academic programs on the recommendation of or in consultation with division faculty. In all instances where this question was answered, appointments were term rather than permanent appontments.

Funding Priorities. Areas spelled out for additional funding included professional development, travel to professional meetings, summer salaries, summer research grants, overload adjustments, department and division chair adjustments, and coaching.

Professional development funds were awarded for advising and academic renewal, research and publication, travel to professional meetings, and sabbaticals.

Most institutions mentioned tuition scholarships for

faculty and faculty dependants. Most colleges had some sort of faculty committee authorized to make the awards.

Chapter 5

RECOMMENDATIONS

Rank

On the basis of the study, it is recommended that faculty rank be determined by the following criteria: (1) expertise/knowledge in discipline, (2) professional performance, (3) service to the college and community, and (4) service to the profession. In general, it is recommended that faculty be ranked as follows: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The instructor rank would require a master's degree or the equivalent. The assistant professor rank would require a terminal degree or a Master's degree plus 30 semester credits beyond the Master's. The additional credits should be in work toward the terminal degree. The associate professor rank would require a terminal degree and at least five years of prior college teaching, the professor rank would require the terminal degree, excellence in teaching, experience in teaching at the associate level, and national recognition.

New employees with master's degrees would be hired at the instructor level; new employees with terminal degrees, but with no prior college teaching experience, would be hired at the assistant professor level.

Criteria

Expertise and Knowledge would be judged on the basis of degree(s) in the discipline; degree(s) in related areas; college level course work taken after the last degree; attendance at non-credit workshops, conferences, and professional meetings; and independent reading, research and product development.

Professional Performance would be judged on the basis of the faculty member's years of successful performance as demonstrated by his/her ability to communicate, ability to stimulate and direct students, and accessibility to students; and his her demonstrated interest and involvement in students' education and professional development.

Service to College and Community would be judged on the basis of advising, committee responsibilities, leadership responsibilities, lectures on campus, service with students, special projects such as curriculum development and grant writing, and such community activities as consulting, lectures and seminar.

Service to Profession would be judged on the basis of publications or, in the case of the arts, exhibits and

performances; papers presented; leadership in professional organizations; membership in professional organizations; and regional and national professional recognition. Various weights would be given to published documents, unpublished documents, refereed publications, and adjudicated exhibits or performances.

Point System

Points of varying levels would be awarded for degrees, years and quality of performance, and documented service to the college, the community and the profession.

Evaluation

Criteria would be judged using student, self, peer, and supervisor evaluations already adopted by the faculty. Faculty need to develop (1) faculty service appraisals, (2) performing and visual arts self and reviewer appraisals, (3) professional growth self and peer appraisals, (4) professional service self and peer appraisals, (5) publications self and peer appraisals, (6) research self and peer appraisals. Models for the appraisals have been developed by Miller (1987) and are included in the second draft of the recommended policy.

Other Points of Governance

The following items related to governance are also recommended:

1. Having considered both tenure and a term contract system, continual year or term contracts are recommended as appropriate for Sheldon Jackson College. New teachers would be hired on a yearly basis for a period not to exceed four years. Following that, four, five, seven and ten year contracts would be offered.

2. To insure that contractual items within the present faculty handbook be distinguished from procedural items, it is recommended that two documents be established - a procedural manual and a contractual handbook. It further is recommended that no changes be made in the contractual document without faculty input.

3. To more effectively dsitribute division responsibilities, it is recommended that in teaching divisions, the position of division chair be a four year term position rather than a permanent position and that appointments to the position be made in consultation with division faculty.

4. In keeping with the concept of collegiality, it is recommended that the President's Cabinet be expanded to include an elected faculty representative and the elected chairperson of the Community Forum.

Implementation

Ad Hoc committee operations should be continued for the remainder of the school year in order that the committee might continue to work with the faculty and the Vice President for Academic Programs on each detail of the

recommendations. We recommend that each phase of the recommendations be discussed first in Division meetings and then in full faculty meeting before approval. Once the faculty has approved the criteria for rank, it will then act up on the point system, and the evaluation system. Following faculty approval of criteria, point and evaluation system, the committee will work with the Vice President for Academic Programs to implement (1) rank to be awarded to present faculty, (2) steps in each rank, and (3) process for ongoing award of rank and status. Upon faculty approval the Policy for Academic Appointment and Rank will be submitted to the President.

The recommended time line for approval is:

Division Approval of Criteria for Rank and Status: December 1987

Faculty Approval of Criteria for Rank and Status: January 1988.

Division Approval of Point and Evaluation Systems: February 1988.

Faculty Approval of Point and Evaluation Systems: March 1988.

Policy submitted to President: March 15, 1988.

Policy submitted to Board of Trustees: May 20, 1988.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors, AAUP Policy Documents and Reports. Washington, D.C.: AAUP, June 1977.

------ The 1940 Statement of the Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Washington, D.C.: AAUP, 1940.

Blackburn, Robert T. et. al. "Evaluating Faculty Performance" in Improving Academic Management . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Chait, Richard P. and Andrew T. Ford, Beyond Traditional Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Commission on Higher Education, Conditions and Responsibilities of Professional Employment in Higher Education. New Jersey: Middle State Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, July 1972.

Faculty and Staff Handbook . Sitka, Alaska: Sheldon Jackson College, 1981-82.

Faculty and Staff Handbook . Sitka, Alaska: Sheldon Jackson College, August 1985.

Groff, Warren et. al. Governance and Management. Ft. Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1983.

Lincoln, Yvonna S., "The Structure of Promotion and Tenure Decisions in Institutions of Higher Education: A Policy Analysis," Review of Higher Education. Spring 1983.

Linsky, Arnold and Murray A. Straus, "Student Evaluations, Research Productivity and Eminence of College Faculty," in Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 46, No. 1, Jan-Feb. 1975, pp. 89-102.

Manaster, Alfred, "The California 'Step System'," in Academe, July-August, 1985, pp.23-26.

McIntosh, Thomas H. and Thomas E. Van Koevering, "Six Year Case Study of Faculty Peer Reviews, Merit Ratings and Pay Awards in a Multidisciplinary Department," The Journal, Spring 1986, pp.5-14.

Miller, Richard I., Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and

Tenure. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Millett, John D. "Relating to Governance and Leadership" in Improving Academic Management . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

"Tenure at Liberal Arts Colleges," Journal of College and University Personnel, Fall/Winter, 1980.

Trow, Martin, "The Analysis of Status," in Clark, Burton R., Perspectives on Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Smelser, Neil, "Social Structural Dimensions of Higher Education," in The American University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973. (cited in Trow)

Wolotkiewicz, Rita J. College Administrator's Handbook . Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGES

SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE

March 16, 1987

President Richard Morrill
Centre College of Kentucky
Danville, KY 40422

Dear Colleague:

I am working with the faculty of Sheldon Jackson College to develop a schedule for Academic Appointment and Rank to recommend to the administration. If your institution has such a schedule, we would appreciate receiving a copy of it.

We would be interested in such data as standards for appointments and guidelines for teaching, research, public/institutional service, faculty workload, and evaluation for retention and promotion. Where are such decisions made - at the division level or at the department level?

What is the administrative structure of your faculty? Are there middle management positions, such as department chairpersons? How are these positions filled and retained?

We would also be interested in current salary information within the several ranks and disciplines.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jan Craddick

Jan Craddick, Professor
Liberal Arts Division

JCHA01/T

"Adventures in Education"

801 LINCOLN STREET SITKA, ALASKA 99835 TELEPHONE (907) 747-5220

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF DATA FOR COLLEGE SURVEYED

August 22, 1987

To: Faculty Ad Hoc Committee
Faculty Rank and Status

From: Jan Craddick

Re: Summary of data for colleges surveyed to date.

Procedures

Letters of inquiry were sent to the 67 other members of the Association of Presbyterian Colleges and Universities, to four other minority institutions, and to three colleges recommended by my Governance professor, Dr. William Groff. To date responses have been received from 44 colleges. Of these, only six (who were revising or preparing materials) were unable to supply us with data at this time.

In some instances the respondees supplied all the information we were seeking. In other instances they did not. Therefore, the summary below includes the varying numbers.

Summary of College Governance

Tenure

Twenty-five or the twenty-six colleges who responded to the question about tenure award tenure. One college. which did not award tenure, did award extended contracts after four years of employment. The first extended contract was for five years, the second for six years, the third for seven, and the fourth for ten.

Faculty Definitions

Included as faculty were the president, vice president for academic programs or academic dean, regular faculty, professional library staff, and the registrar. Some schools excluded part-time or adjunct faculty or made them non-voting members.

Governance

Most schools involved some sort of faculty committee in the process of rank and status; e.g. a Rank and Tenure Committee, an Educational Policy Committee, or a Faculty Personnel Committee. All spelled out a process for peer and

supervisor recommendations. Beaver College has an extensive document spelling out procedures.

Priorities

Several schools limited the percent of professors receiving tenure. Areas spelled out for additional funding included: professional development, travel to professional meetings, summer salaries and summer research grants, overload adjustments, department and division chair adjustments, and coaching. Queens College had special awards worth noting:

> Queens Teaching Award-$1000- nominated by colleagues on basis of scholarship, integrity, love of teaching, creativity in working with students.
>
> Grier Distinguished Professor Award-$2,500-nominated by faculty, reviewed by Executive Council, final selection by President on basis of extraordinary and unique contribution to teaching and learning at Queens.
>
> Carol G. Belk Faculty Fellowship-$1,000/year for 2 years-nominated by faculty, reviewed by Faculty Enrichment Committee, submitted by President to Board on basis of research, scholarly activity or individual creativity to encourage professor in enhancing knowledge within a defined academic area.

Merit

Faculty is responsible for documenting merit-related and other professional development activities via professional records. Criteria for merit increases include:

- superior achievement in teaching
- research and scholarship
- advising
- service to college, community and world
- participating in governance
- participating in professional associations

Professional Development Activities

Funds are awarded for such activities as advising and academic renewal, research and publication, travel to professional meetings, and sabbaticals.

Summary of Data on Rank

Instructor

Levels. Pay steps up to 16 years were mentioned but the usual steps were for 3 or 4 years, the presumption being that after 4 years the instructor would move to assistant professor status.

Salary ranges. Varied with levels. Average was $20,364.00.

Degree required. Master's degree or equivalent was usual requirement. Faculty with doctorates were hired at Asst. Professor Rank.

Teaching. Ability to teach required.

Professional Development. Successful annual professional development required by most. Several colleges required plans for study toward terminal degree.

Assistant Professor

Levels. Up to 16 years and 4 levels.

Salaries. Varied with levels. Average was $23,810.

Degree. 16 colleges required terminal degree, 9 listed Master's or Master's plus 30 or 45 as an alternative. Several specified that the additional credits had to be work toward terminal degree.

Teaching. No teaching experience required of those with terminal degrees. 3 or more years required of those with Master's degrees.

Professional Development. 8 colleges required successful annual professional development at this rank.

Research. 5 colleges mentioned or required ability to do scholarly or creative work at this rank.

Contributions. Committee work, value to college, contribution to academic and spiritual goals of college, institutional service mentioned for steps within rank. 7

colleges responded to this question for this rank.

Associate Professor.

Levels. Up to 4 steps mentioned,

Salary. Varied with levels. Average was $27,515.

Degree. 16 schools required the terminal degree. 3 listed Master's plus 45 as an alternative. 3 listed comparable professional achievements as an alternative.

Teaching. Amount of prior teaching varied with degree and level. Ranged from 5 to 10 years of prior college teaching.

Professional Development. Successful annual professional development, demonstrated growth in scholship listed as criteria.

Research. Criteria mentioned included outstanding contribution to academic life of department, evidence of creative scholarly activities, continuing productive scholarship. Two colleges specifically required publication.

Contributions. Service to community and college, leadership, congruence with institutional identity.

Professor

Levels. Up to 4.

Salaries. Varied with levels. Average was $34,500.

Degree. All required Ph.D. or equivalent.

Teaching. Amount of experience varied with level. Specific critera: excellence in teaching, experience teaching at associate rank, rank reserved for outstanding teachers who have contributed to field and institution, not just seniority. Blackburn criteria worth review.

Professional Development. Extensive scholarly or creative activity, professional accomplishment, scholarship , of nationally recognized merit.

Research. Criteria: successful research, significant contribution to field.

x.

Contributions. Exemplary contributions to college life, consistant contributions to academic and spiritual goals of institution, national recognition, effectiveness as a faculty member, congruence with mission of college, participation in college community.

Other

Professor Emeritus. requires terminal degree, awarded after 15 years of distinguished service, exceptional achievement, national recognition.

Lecturer. requires Master's degree, teaching competence.

Senior Lecturer. requires Master's degree, college experience.

Visiting Scholar, Artist in Residence, Scholar in Residence. competence in field, successful experience in field, notable attainment in profession.

Adjunct faculty. same as for full-time.

APPENDIX C

FIRST DRAFT - POLICY FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT AND RANK

Draft Recommendation for Criteria to Consider for Establishing Faculty Rank from AdHoc Committee Aug 26, 1987

EXPERTISE/KNOWLEDGE	PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE	SERVICE TO COLLEGE	SERVICE TO PROFESSION/COMMUNITY
Degree(s) in discipline	Ability to communicate	Advising	Publications/shows, etc
Degree(s) in related area	Ability to stimulate and direct students	Committee responsibilities	Independent reading/research/product development
College level coursework taken after last degree	Accessibility to students	Leadership responsibilities	Membership in organizations
Non-Credit Workshops/conf.	Demonstrated interest and involvment in students' education/prof dev	Ability to work with other faculty - solve problems	Leaderships in organizations
Professional Meetings		Lectures on campus	Community involvement
	Years of successful performance	Additional service with students	Consulting
		Special projects: curriculum development	Lectures (non-credit/seminars)...
	Measures:	grant writing	Membership in Professional Assoc
	Student evaluation	...	
	Peer evaluation		National Recognition
	Self evaluation		
	Administrative evaluation		
	Alumni/graduates		

POINT SYSTEM (Some general guidelines are suggested - more specific ones should be worked out. Monitoring and adjustments should be made by a Committee on Rank and Merit)

100 points for terminal degree (ABD, PhD, Dr. MFA, MBA)	60 points for each yr of acceptable performance	Faculty would have to document this each year	Faculty would document
50 pts for 1 degree below	80 pts for each year of satisfactory performance	Committee reviews and assigns points	Committee would assign points
25 pts for 2 degree below	90 pts for each year good per		60 points for normal service activities
25 pts for recognized ability/ not degree	100 pts for each year "excellent performance"	+60 pts for doing just the required	+10 points for each additional or outstanding service
(Pts from only 1 of the above)		+10 points for each additional above average service provided	(Specific points could be established:
+10 for additional degree	Committe would review documentation and assign points		10 for a book published
+5 for each 3 cr course beyond degree in related area			2 for professional article
+2 for related workshop/ conference			...

XII

CRITERIA FOR EACH LEVEL OF THE RANKING SYSTEM

Level	EXPERTISE/KNOWLEDGE	PERFORMANCE	SERVICE TO COLLEGE	SERVICE TO PROFESSION	TOTAL
Instructor	25pts				25pts
Assist Prof	75	320 (4 yr)*	240*	240*	900*
Assoc Prof	100	560 (7 yr)	540	540	2000
Professor	100	960 (12 yr)	840	890	3100
**	50	960	840	840	3100

Points given above are the minimums in each level and represent the number of points the "average" faculty member would earn each year time the number of years of teaching required. The total is higher than the sum of each column to require "better than average" performance in at least one of the areas. A person cannot be promoted if minimums in each area have not been met.

55

*Or substitute with a terminal degree at time of employment

** Yet to be titled - for outstanding faculty who do not meet the requirements of Professor

Person also could advance faster than the years indicated with outstanding performance so that total points equal next level.

56

GOVERNANCE ISSUES BROCHURES FOR CONSIDERATION

APPENDIX D

RECOMMENDED POLICY FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT AND RANK

Revised Policy for Academic Appointment and Rank
from Ad Hoc Committee
November 1987

CRITERIA

I. Expertise/Knowledge in Discipline

Degree(s) in discipline
Degree(s) in related area
College level course work taken after last degree
Noncredit workshops/conferences
Professional meetings
Independent reading/research/product development

II. Professional Performance

Years of successful performance as documented by:
- ability to communicate
- ability to stimulate and direct students
- accessibility to students

Demonstrated interest and involvement in student's education and professional development

III. Service to College and Community

Advising
Committee Responsibilities
Leadership Responsibilities
Lectures on campus
Special projects:
- curriculum development
- grant writing

Community involvement:
- consulting
- lectures/seminars
- organizations

IV. Service to Profession

publications/exhibits/performances
papers presented
leadership in professional organizations
membership in professional organizations
professional recognition:
- regional
- national

POINTS FOR CRITERIA (general guidelines)

I. Expertise
(counts for 20% of total points)

140 for terminal degree in discipline (Ph.D., Ed.D., MFA, MBA)
110 for ABD or terminal degree in related area
95 for master's plus 30 hours of graduate work in discipline
50 for master's in discipline
25 for bachelor's in discipline

The following points can accumulate:

3 for each 3 credit course beyond degree
1 for related workshops/conferences/meetings
1 for independent reading/research
1-5 for product development

II. Professional Performance
(counts for 30-40% of total)

Demonstrated ability to:
communicate 1-12/year
stimulate and direct students 1-12/year
Assessibility to students 1-12/year
Demonstrated interest and involvement in students' education/professional development 1-12/year
(these points accumulate)

III. Service to college/community
(counts for 20-25% of total)

1-5 points/yr. for advising
1-5 points/yr. for committee responsibilities
1-5 points/yr. for leadership responsibilities
1-5 points/yr. for problem solving responsibilities
1-5 points for lectures on campus
1-5 points/project for special projects:
curriculum development
grant writing
community service/involvement:
1-5 points for consulting
1-5 points for community lectures/seminars
1 points for membership in professionally related community organizations

IV. Service to profession
(counts for 20-25% of total)

24-30 points for publications/exhibits/performances:
Books
Major:
refereed journals, juried exhibits, adjudicated performances
other journals, exhibits, performances
Minor:
other periodicals
newspaper columns, signed reviews
1 point/yr./organization for membership in professional organizations
5-10 points/organization for leadership in professional organizations
1-3 points for state recognition
5 points for regional recognition
10 points for national recognition
(each division will need to list specifics and assign points, keeping total within the range)

POINTS FOR RANK (Minimums needed)

Categories	I	II	III	IV	Total
Instructor	50	-	-	-	50
Asst. Prof.	95	142-190	95-119	95-119	475
Assoc. Prof.	140	210-280	140-175	140-175	700
Prof.	200	300-400	200-250	200-250	1000

(Each division will have one minimum number after percentages have been selected.)

PROCEDURES

1. Each faculty documents achievements in each category and submits it along with the Professional Development Plan December 1.

2. Requests for promotion come trhough division and are forwarded to the Professional Development Committee by the Division Chair.

3. Professional Development Committee has the responsibility of recommending promotions to administration. Committee reviews documentation. Division chair attends meeting for his/her faculty and provides input. Committee submits

recommendation to Academic Dean by Feb. 1.

4. Administration makes decisions by March 1.

5. Board of Trustees reviews requests at May meeting.

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Expertise

Degrees and college course work from regionally accredited institutions
Credits and workshops/conferences in area of assigned responsibility
Reading/research/product development approved prior to study/development

Professional Performance

Standard evaluation forms (SJC and sample forms attached) will be developed to measure communication skills, directing students, and assessibility
Demonstrated interest and involvement must be documented by faculty member

Service to College/Community/Profession

Faculty will document activities/responsibilities
Yearly log will be included in Professional Development file

SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE
STUDENT OPINION POLL

Dept. & Course No._____ Course Title_____

Instructor_____ Semester_____ 19____

Please Complete the Form Below by Circling the Response that Best Reflects Your Feelings About this Course.

PART I. SELF - EVALUATION	CIRCLE ONE		
1. About how many sessions of this course have you missed?	0-3	4-7	8 or more
2. About how many assignments did you complete?	all	most	a few
3. What grade do you think you deserve in this course?	A B C D F P NP		
4. For you, is this course	REQUIRED		ELECTIVE

PART II. INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	POOR
1. Rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter.	4	3	2	1
2. Rate the instructor's daily class preparation.	4	3	2	1
3. Please rate the ability of the instructor to communicate the subject matter.	4	3	2	1
4. Overall rating of the instructor as an effective teacher	4	3	2	1
5. Please rate the course as to its meeting stated course objectives.	4	3	2	1
6. Please rate the helpfulness of the instructor in providing feedback regarding your progress (i.e., tests, paper returns, conferences, individual help).	4	3	2	1
7. Please rate the fairness and impartiality of grading	4	3	2	1
8. Would you recommend this instructor to a friend?.		YES	NO	

PART III. COURSE EVALUATION	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	POOR
1. Rate the textbook used in this course. .	4	3	2	1
2. Rate the tests given (as to number, difficulty, length, etc.).	4	3	2	1
3. Rate the course as to raising one's level as an educated person.	4	3	2	1
4. Would you recommend this course to a friend?		YES	NO	

PLEASE MAKE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS WHICH WILL HELP THE INSTRUCTOR AND COLLEGE IMPROVE THIS COURSE. YOU MAY USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET FOR FURTHER COMMENTS.

SELF AND PEER EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In 1980, the faculty adopted the following self and peer evaluation procedures. The evaluation schedule for each instructor should be such that all courses taught are evaluated every three years. The process is to be monitored by each division.

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION SEQUENCE:

1. List your course objectives in order of their priority (see p. 3.3 for course syllabus procedures).

2. Respond to the following questions or statements:

   (a) Do the objectives match the course description in the catalog? Do they match the expectations of others who use the course as a prerequisite?

   (b) List for each course objective the institutional objective as PRIMARY or COMPLEMENTARY for each, and ascertain if they are appropriate to the course or catalog descriptions (see p. 4.1).

   (c) For each course objective, list the "entry" requirement for your student

3. List the activities that students must complete to achieve the objectives.

4. Evaluate the amount of time you spend in class and require students to spend out of class to fulfill each objective. Compare the distribution of time with your prioritization of objectives.

5. Re-examine the requirements you listed in Step 2 (c) of entry level requirements for students. What do you do instructionally to accommodate students' lack of essential requirements?

6. Which learning activities work best/worst? Why?

7. Summarize the means used to determine how well your course objectives have been fulfilled.

PEER EVALUATION SEQUENCE:

1. Select a colleague with whom you are comfortable.
2. Share your course syllabus with the colleague.
3. Invite him/her to visit your class, or prepare a video tape for his/her perusal.
4. Provide the colleague with goals and objectives for the visitation.
5. After the visitation, arrange a conference.
6. Write up the results of the conference and both sign it.
7. File the peer conference report with the Vice President for Academic Pro
8. Confer with Vice President for Academic Programs.
9. Return the favor to a colleague.

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

STEP 1. List your course objectives in order of their priority to you putting most important first. (Be prepared to re-order these later if you discover cause, and to add objectives which you may also discover.)

STEP 2. Write out the answers to three sets of questions:

(a.) Does your list of objectives match the course description in the catalog? Does it match the expectations of others who use the course as a prerequisite? Should you revise to meet those external demands? If so, what other objectives must be added? How should the course description now be revised?

(b.) List for each course objective the institutional objective as PRIMARY or COMPLEMENTARY for each. (Do not be surprised if some course objectives cannot be directly traced to institutional ones!).

(c.) For each course objectives describe the 'entry' condition of your students: (1) What prior learnings do they bring which are essential or prerequisite to this objective? (If they lack essentials you need to consider how you plan to help them get those learnings.) (2) What sense of need do the students bring to accomplishing that objective? (If they have none, you will need to develop it as a part of your pedagogical plan!). (3) What motivations do the students bring to each objective? (All students have things which motivate them; if there is no direct line between their motivations and your objective, you may have to create a bridge if the learning is to take place).

STEP 3. Make a task analysis of each course objective. List each step that a student takes (in the order to be taken) to get your objective fulfilled. Keep 'backing up' until you're sure that you have anticipated all the things the student need to do. Try to think like the student so you don't avoid any step.

STEP 4. You are now moving to evaluation of your 'pedagogy' -- everything you do and ask students to do to enhance their learning. Describe the amount of time you spend in class and require students to spend out of class to fulfill each objective. How well does this distribution of time match your prioritization of objectives? Are there changes you should make to get a better fit between time allocation and objective priority?

STEP 5. Examine each objective in the light of the taxonomies of educational objectives. After classifying each objective within the cognitive, affective, psychomotor domains, determine if you have adequately prepared students for that learning task. Remember that the levels are sequential, i.e., some aspect of each preceeding domain level must preceed the next level. Suggest corrections in your sequences of learning activities to accommodate the hierarchies.

STEP 6. Examine each ojective in the light of principles of learning theory, specifically RETENTION, MOTIVATION, TRANSFER. Describe what you are doing to apply those principles of learning properly and what modifications you plan to make to apply each better.

STEP 7. Examine the description you made in step 2c of entry level of students. Describe what you do instructionally to accommodate student's lack of prior essential learnings, needs and motivations. Note: The failure or difficulty students have in accomplishing a particular objective or sub-objective may be explainable in this evaluative step. You may need to adjust learning activities to recognize one or more 'gaps'.

STEP 8. Which of the learning activities works best/worst? Analyze why for each according to what you do to make them work. Establish a list of things to improve (and perhaps abandon or add) according to your own estimate of the kinds of learning activities that best suit your personality and teaching style.

STEP 9. Examine how you measure and make judgements about the degree to which your course objectives have been fulfilled.

(a.) Are you measuring fulfillment of what you say are the objective (Don't kid yourself here; it may be easy to measure some things so you fall in the trap of doing that without really measuring the objectives

(b.) Are you weighing heaviest and spending most time measuring/evaluating the highest priority objectives? What changes should you make?

(c.) Are considering the student limitations you described earlier (step 2c) to give the best advantage to students to demonstrate fulfillment of objectives? What changes/alternatives might you make to do this better?

(d.) Are you making the best possible use of your time in evaluating fulfillment of objectives? What short cuts can you take without jeopardizing 9a, 9b, 9c? How can students help you (without leading them into temptation)?

Faculty Service and Relations Appraisal

Name of teacher _____ Year _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Directions: Please write in the blank space the number that describes your judgment of each factor as it relates to an individual's faculty service and relations on the campus. Rate the individual on each item, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions may be added as items 6 and 7.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

____ 1. Acceptance of college assignments. Does the faculty member accept college assignments willingly? Does he volunteer occasionally?
____ 2. Attitude. Does the faculty member act in the best interests of the department and the college? Does he take a professional attitude toward human relations and personnel problems? Does he have a positive attitude?
____ 3. Cooperation. To what extent does the faculty member assist colleagues and others with their problems? Is she a good team member?
____ 4. Performance on college assignments. What is his performance level? How do colleagues perceive his performance?
____ 5. Professional behavior as it relates to professional activities and the goals and nature of the institution. Does she act responsibly?
____ 6.
____ 7.
_____ Composite rating.

Description of specific faculty assignments and services: _____

Professional Growth Appraisal

Name of teacher _____ Year _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Professional growth comprises those activities that assist one in keeping a sense of scholarship, learning, optimism, and forward movement. It relates to teaching, scholarship, and service.

Directions: Please write in the blank space the number that describes your judgment of that factor as it relates to an individual's professional growth. Rate the individual on each item, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions may be added as items 6 and 7.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

____ 1. Attends campus-based programs that are relevant to knowledge or pedagogical advancement (professional renewal).
____ 2. Attends off-campus programs that can assist in professional renewal.
____ 3. Keeps up to date in his or her professional field through membership in appropriate organizations and societies.
____ 4. Seeks personal professional renewal by developing innovative activities in the classroom or laboratory.
____ 5. Expresses interest in renewal and innovation in informal conversations.
____ 6.
____ 7.
_____ Composite rating.

Comments: _____

Performing and Visual Arts: Self-Appraisal

Teacher _____ Date _____
Title of presentation _____
Place or occasion of presentation _____
Time spent on this project _____

1. Describe the presentation, including a statement of your intention or purpose. _____
2. Discuss briefly any special difficulties that you encountered in producing the work or in making arrangements for its presentation or exhibition. _____
3. Were other faculty members or students included in this production, performance, or exhibition project? If so, who and to what extent? _____
4. How was the work received by the audience or the spectators? _____
5. How was the work received by the critics? _____
6. Do you think the reaction of the audience or spectators and the reaction of the critics were justifiable in terms of your stated intentions for the project? _____
7. How did you feel about this production or exhibition? _____

Other comments: _____

Performing and Visual Arts: Reviewer's Appraisal

Teacher _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Directions: In rating each activity, give the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Place in the blank space before each statement the number that most nearly expresses your view. Additional items may be included, and the space at the end of the survey allows a narrative statement.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

_____ 1. Judgments of colleagues.
_____ 2. Judgments of other professionals.
_____ 3. Self-appraisal (by director of production).
_____ 4. Tenor of newspaper review.
_____ 5. Views of students.
_____ 6.
_____ 7.
_____ Composite rating.

Nature of performance: _____

Additional comments: _____

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN

DESCRIPTION

The Sheldon Jackson College faculty commits itself to improving professional, and nurturing personal growth, in order to provide better services to the students. Therefore, each faculty member must develop a professional growth plan to be filed with the Academic Dean by November 1 each year. This plan will include one of the following:

(a) Improvement of instruction;

(b) Growth in academic area and/or research;

(c) Personal growth.

The format of the plan will include:

(a) A written self-assessment evaluating one's current situation;

(b) General goals for two to five years;

(c) Specific objectives for achieving the goals;

(d) Calendar of events to achieve the goals;

(e) Specific activities for each objective;

(f) Means of assessing progress toward goals;

(g) Requirements for leaves of absence to achieve goals.

DIVISION PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN PROCEDURES

Dec. 1

Each member of the division will submit a Professional Growth Plan to a peer on the faculty with the following three sections:

(a) An evaluation of professional projects of the previous year;
(b) An evaluation of professional strengths and weaknesses; and
(c) A plan for professional growth and development for 1982-83.

Dec. 15

The peer who is reviewing the colleague's Growth Plan returns the Plan with comments.

Jan. 15

A final draft of the three part Professional Development Growth Plan is submitted to the Academic Dean and a copy is filed in the division file which is under the supervision of the division chairman.

Feb. 15

The Academic Dean submits comments on the Professional Development Plan to the faculty member, with a copy of comments to the division file.

PEER EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In December 1980, the Faculty adopted the following self and peer evaluation procedures. The evaluation schedule for each instructor should be such that all courses taught are evaluated every 3 years. The process is to be monitored by each division.

Peer Evaluation Sequence:

1. Select a colleague with whom you are comfortable.
2. Share your course syllabus and evaluation.
3. After your partner has analyzed your appraisal, invite your colleague to visit your class, or prepare a video tape for his/her perusal.
4. After your partner has viewed the class, arrange a conference.
5. Write up the results of your peer conference.
6. File the syllabus, course evaluation and peer conference report with your administrative supervisor. Set up an appointment to discuss these with supervisor.
7. Confer with supervisor and begin implementing a growth plan that is your own statement of expectation on how you plan to improve the course. Be prepared to incorporate student evaluation input in this conference.
8. Return the favor to your peer partner.
9. Start evaluating another course.

INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION

STEP 1. List your course objectives in order of their priority to you putting most important first.

STEP 2. Write out the answers to three sets of questions or statements:

(a) Do the objectives match the course description in the catalog? Do the match the expectations of others who use the course as a prerequisite?

(b) List for each course objective the institutional objective as PRIMARY or COMPLEMENTARY for each, and ask if they are appropriate to the course or catalog descriptions.

(c) For each course objective, describe the "entry" condition of your students:

(1) What prior learnings do they bring which are essential or prerequisite to this objective?

(2) What sense of need do the students bring to accomplishing that objective?

(3) What motivations do the students bring to each objective?

STEP 3. List each step that a student must take to fulfill the objectives.

STEP 4. Describe the amount of time you spend in class and require students to spend out of class to fulfill each objective. How well does this distribution of time match your prioritization of objectives?

STEP 5. Examine the description you made in Step 2 (c) of entry level of students. Describe what you do instructionally to accommodate student's lack of prior essential learnings, needs and motivations.

STEP 6. Which of the learning activities works best/worst? Analyze why for each according to what you do to make them work.

STEP 7. Examine how you measure and make judgments about the degree to which your course objectives have been fulfilled.

Professional Service Appraisal

Professor _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Professional service includes off-campus activities that are related to one's professional field.

Directions: An individual should be rated on each item that is appropriate for him or her. Give the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions and comments may be added.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

____ 1. Activity in professional associations and societies. (state which ones) _____

_____

____ 2. Offices in professional associations and societies. (state which ones) _____

_____

____ 3. Papers or other presentations before professional groups. (state what papers and which groups) _____

_____

____ 4. Professional service as viewed by colleagues.

_____

_____

____ 5. Professional service as viewed by the profession.

_____

_____

____ 6. Professional recognition in terms of awards and honors. (state which ones) _____

_____

____ 7.

____ 8.

_____ Composite rating.

Publications Appraisal: Books and Monographs

Professor _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Directions: Place in the blank space before each appropriate statement the number that most nearly expresses your findings, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions and comments may be added.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

List each book (title, publisher, number of pages, date; or list each contract signed and make a progress report if writing is under way): _____

_____

_____

____ 1. Generally speaking, how does the publisher rank in this particular field?

____ 2. How do colleagues within the department generally rate the publication?

____ 3. How do colleagues outside the institution rate the publication?

____ 4. How does the department chairperson rate the publication?

____ 5. How has the book been reviewed?

____ 6. Has the book been cited or quoted?

____ 7. How does the author rate the book?

____ 8.

____ 9.

_____ Composite rating on book (total score/number of items used).

Comments: _____

_____

Publications Appraisal: Chapters in Book

Name _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Directions: Place in the blank space before each appropriate statement the number that most nearly expresses your findings, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions and comments may be added.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

List each chapter in a book:

_____
_____
_____
_____

____ 1. Generally speaking, how does the publisher rate in this particular field?
____ 2. How do colleagues within the department rate the chapter?
____ 3. How do colleagues outside the institution rate the chapter?
____ 4. How does the department chairperson rate the chapter?
____ 5. How has the chapter been reviewed?
____ 6. Has the chapter been cited or quoted?
____ 7. How does the author rate the chapter?
____ 8.
____ 9.

_____ Composite rating on chapter (total score/number of items used).

Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____

Publications Appraisal: Periodical Articles

Name _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Directions: Place in the blank space before each appropriate statement the number that most nearly expresses your findings, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions and comments may be added.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

List each periodical article:

_____
_____
_____

____ 1. Generally speaking, how does the publisher rate in this particular field?
____ 2. How do colleagues within the department rate the article?
____ 3. How do colleagues outside the institution rate the article?
____ 4. How does the department chairperson rate the article?
____ 5. How has the article been reviewed?
____ 6. Has the article been cited or quoted?
____ 7. How does the author rate the article?
____ 8.
____ 9.

_____ Composite rating on article (total score/number of items used).

Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Research Appraisal: Résumé

Professor _____ Date _____

Directions: The person who is undertaking or has completed the research should fill in this form. (Use additional pages wherever necessary.)

1. Nature of research project. _____
2. Were the goals of the project well defined? _____
3. Were these goals realistic with respect to time and resources? _____
4. Which obstacles have been overcome? How was this achieved? _____
5. Which resources have you found most available and useful? _____
6. Which resources did you find lacking? _____
7. Has the college community been receptive to your work? _____
8. Have your colleagues taken an active interest in your research? _____
9. Has the research changed, modified, or enhanced your theoretical position? _____
10. If students were involved, what were their reactions toward the project? _____
11. What are your plans regarding publication? _____

Research Appraisal: By Others

Professor _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Status of research:
completed _____
ongoing _____ (when started) _____

Nature of research:
(brief description or attached outline)

_____
_____
_____

Time involved:
What proportion of the author's professional time was spent on this project?

_____

100% 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0%

Directions: Place in the blank space before each statement the number that most nearly expresses your findings.

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

____ 1. How do colleagues within the department generally rate the research?
____ 2. How do colleagues outside the institution rate the research?
____ 3. How has the report been reviewed?
____ 4. Has the research been cited or quoted?
____ 5. How does the author rate the research?
____ 6.
____ 7.
_____ Composite rating.

Comments: _____
_____
_____

Public Service Appraisal

Professor _____ Date _____
Appraiser _____ Title _____

Nature of service: _____

_____

_____

_____

Time involved: Some quantitative appraisal should be made of the professional time spent. The percentage of time given to public service, including consulting, should be calculated as carefully as possible.

_____

100% 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0%

Directions: Place in the blank space before each statement the number that most nearly expresses your findings, giving the highest scores for exceptional performances and the lowest scores for very poor performances. Additional questions and comments may be added.

XXX

Exceptional			Moderately Good			Very Poor	Don't Know
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	X

____ 1. Contribution of service: What is the value of the service, judged by those who receive it and by the department chairperson?

____ 2. Quality of performance: This criterion should be appraised primarily by colleagues and those professionals who can judge the quality of the individual's professional contribution.

____ 3.

____ 4.

_____ Composite rating.

Comments: _____

_____

_____

80